

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/071,213 | MANK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | N. Bhat | 1764 | |

All Participants:

(1) N. Bhat.

(2) J. Sopp.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 25 August 2006
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Improper dependency Claim 14. Claim 14 depends on itself Third inventor Bruno Domergue, no signature.

Claims discussed:

14

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Applicant's attorney authorized correction of the dependency by Examiner's Amendment- Claim 14 depends from claim 13. The attorney faxed in a new oath with signature of 3rd inventor.
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)